BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE

06-23-06 03:50 PM

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U-902-E) for Adoption of an Advanced Metering Infrastructure Deployment Scenario and Associated Cost Recovery and Rate Design.

Application 05-03-015

THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES' RESPONSE TO THE MOTION OF SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR LEAVE TO PROPOSE A CRITICAL PEAK PRICING RATE IN ITS ADVANCED METERING INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEEDING, APPLICATION 05-03-015

Pursuant to Rule 45 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates hereby responds to the motion of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) for leave to propose a critical peak pricing (CPP) rate in this proceeding. In general, DRA does not object to SDG&E's motion. However, DRA has some concerns.

1. Incorporating a default CPP tariff for large Commercial and Industrial ("C&I") customers three weeks before DRA's testimony is due presents complications. It may cause further delay of the AMI proceeding.

Different CPP rate designs for large C&I customers which were illustrative in SDG&E's testimony as opposed to the proposed rate designs in SDG&E's motion would have a significant affect on three chapters of SDG&E's testimony: Chapters 5, 6, & 14, as well as other related chapters (Chapters 2 and 15). SDG&E's illustrative CPP rate design for large C&I customers in the March 28, 2006 testimony was based on the CPP Phase II Settlement Agreement, which was rejected by the Commission in Decision 05-06-038.

The illustrative CPP rates in Chapter 14 and the participation rates in Chapter 5 are two of the main inputs for Chapter 6, Demand Response Benefits. Any changes in Chapter 6 would affect SDG&E's AMI business case summary in Chapter 2, AMI Business Vision and Chapter 15, AMI Revenue Requirement.

Based on SDG&E's representations in a telephone conference with DRA on June 8, 2006, DRA understands that SDG&E intended to submit a CPP rate design proposal for large C&I customers in this proceeding based on its original testimony in the CPP Phase II proceeding (A.05-06-017), which is different from the Settlement Agreement. Therefore, if the Commission grants SDG&E's motion, SDG&E would have to update its analysis for Chapter 5, AMI Marketing and Customer Programs, Chapter 6, as well as other affected chapters of its testimony.

DRA is loathe to have to once again raise the issue of timing, but under the circumstances, has no choice. DRA witnesses assigned these chapters would need additional time to review SDG&E's update testimony and workpapers. Under the current internal schedule, DRA's final draft testimony for its upper management review is due two weeks before the testimony mailing date. Obviously, leaving one week for DRA witnesses to review SDG&E's updated testimony, to send data requests, and to complete the draft testimony, is unrealistic and unfair. It is DRA's estimation that it needs a minimum of three additional weeks to perform the necessary analysis and discovery.

Many parties actively participated in the CPP Phase II proceeding and raised many issues regarding SDG&E's CPP rate design proposal. DRA was not actively involved in that proceeding, and although SDG&E has indicated that most of the discovery and analysis for CPP rates has already been performed, it is still new to DRA's analyst, especially in the context of this AMI proceeding. DRA believes that many of CPP Phase II proceeding participants are not actively participating in this proceeding. If the Commission grants SDG&E's motion, these parties should be notified and given sufficient time to serve testimony in this proceeding. This process may cause additional delays. In fact, the City of San Diego filed a response to SDG&E's motion, in which it

opposes it for various reasons, one of them being that this is an inappropriate proceeding, would take the case beyond its present scope, and that it would cause delay.

2. Implementing default CPP for large C&I customers does not require an AMI system.

In its motion, SDG&E states that "The AMI proceeding is the logical forum in which to consider CPP since this rate offering is integral to SDG&E's AMI business case." (page 2). SDG&E's statement reflects the fact that SDG&E has included all of the demand response benefits from the default CPP rate design based on the Settlement Agreement in the CPP Phase II proceeding in its AMI business case. Whether SDG&E's AMI business case should include all of the demand response benefits from the default CPP rate design for the large C&I customers is an issue that DRA is currently investigating. It is DRA's understanding that all of SDG&E's large C&I customers with demand over 200 kW already have hourly interval meters. SDG&E can implement the default CPP rates without an AMI system. DRA believes that in the CPP Phase II proceeding, it was the Commission's intention to implement default CPP rates for large C&I customers without requiring SDG&E's AMI system.

Therefore, although it is true that the Commission may be able to implement default CPP rates for large customers sooner in this proceeding than SDG&E's next rate design proceeding, granting SDG&E's motion to implement such a rate design in this proceeding may cause some unnecessary complications and delay of the schedule. The Commission should balance its objectives in considering SDG&E's motion.

///

///

///

Should the Commission grant SDG&E's motion, DRA respectfully requests that the present schedule be continued by a minimum of three weeks.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ PAUL ANGELOPULO

By: __

PAUL ANGELOPULO

Attorney for:

DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES

California Public Utilities Commission

San Francisco, CA 94102 Tel. No.: (415) 703-4742 Fax No.: (415) 703-2262

E-mail: pfa@cpuc.ca.gov

June 23, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of "THE DIVISION OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES' RESPONSE TO THE MOTION OF SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR LEAVE TO PROPOSE A CRITICAL PEAK PRICING RATE IN ITS ADVANCED METERING INFRASTRUCTURE PROCEEDING, APPLICATION 05-03-015" in A.05-03-015 by using the following service:

[X] E-Mail Service: sending the entire document as an attachment to al
known parties of record who provided electronic mail addresses.

[] U.S. Mail Service: mailing by first-class mail with postage prepaid to all known parties of record who did not provide electronic mail addresses.

Executed in San Francisco, California, on the 23rd day of June, 2006.

/s/	Rebecca Rojo	
	Rebecca Rojo	

NOTICE

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address and/or e-mail address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

Proceeding: A0503015 - SDG&E List Name: E-MAIL ADDRESS

sdebroff@sasllp.com
fortlieb@sandiego.gov
mshames@ucan.org
KCordova@semprautilities.com
kmorton@sempra.com
renee@gem-corp.com
chris@emeter.com
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
nsuetake@turn.org
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov
pfa@cpuc.ca.gov
Pforkin@tejassec.com

hyao@semprautilities.com ashirley@ivorycapital.com case.admin@sce.com janet.combs@sce.com vthompson@sempra.com liddell@energyattorney.com scottanders@sandiego.edu centralfiles@semprautilities.com pcharles@semprautilities.com wkeilani@semprautilities.com kgolden@adamsbroadwell.com tgulesserian@adamsbroadwell.com bruce.foster@sce.com marcel@turn.org dwang@nrdc.org gchang1@bloomberg.net bwt4@pge.com DJRo@pge.com jcr4@pge.com klm3@pge.com Irn3@pge.com cem@newsdata.com jnazzal@llgm.com cpuccases@pge.com tony.foster@itron.com mrw@mrwassoc.com dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net jeff@jbsenergy.com tdtamarkin@usclcorp.com rabbott@plexusresearch.com agc@cpuc.ca.gov adf@cpuc.ca.gov

237933 2

bsk@cpuc.ca.gov

cjb@cpuc.ca.gov
dmg@cpuc.ca.gov
eaq@cpuc.ca.gov
jaa@cpuc.ca.gov
jf2@cpuc.ca.gov
lmi@cpuc.ca.gov
mbe@cpuc.ca.gov
fly@cpuc.ca.gov
mcv@cpuc.ca.gov
nil@cpuc.ca.gov
gig@cpuc.ca.gov
scl@cpuc.ca.gov
tmr@cpuc.ca.gov
mmesseng@energy.state.ca.us